UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,659	01/02/2002	Tanya Couch	SVL920010074US1/2304P	6531

45728 7590 10/16/2008

IBM ST-SVL
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
2465 E. Bayshore Road, Suite No. 406
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER	
BETIT, JACOB F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/16/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@sawyerlawgroup.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/037,659	COUCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacob F. Bétit	2169	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 July 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-19,21-24,91 and 92* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-19, 21-24, and 91-92* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/31/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 31 July 2008 has been entered.

Remarks

2. In response to communications filed on 31 July 2008, claims 1, 3-19, 21-24, and 91-92 are presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-24, and 91-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Meier et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,058,393).

As to claim 1, Drexter teaches a method for converting messaging data into a relational table format in a database system, wherein the messaging data being within a messaging system (see page 1, paragraph 0002), the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing a plurality of table formatting specifications; (see page 2, paragraph 0029);

(b) utilizing the plurality of table formatting specifications to automatically build a table function (see page 3, paragraph 0034); and

(c1) invoking the table function to access the messaging data (see pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0033); and

(c2) converting the messaging data into relational table format according to the plurality of table formatting specifications (c3) populating a relational table within the database system with the converted messaging data (see page 3, paragraph 0033).

Drexter does not distinctly disclose storing a table function in the database system, and invoking the table function from within the database system through a single database language statement.

Meier et al. teaches this, see column 2, line 33 through column 3, line 42. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Meier et al. because the location of the table function in no way effects the result of what happens when the table function is invoked to convert the message data. Therefore it would be obvious to have the table function be part of the database and to be invoked using a language statement of the database to produce the same predictable results.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the database with the table function because it is commonplace that combination of two things typically used together into a single thing is obvious. See, e.g., Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co., 396 U.S. 57 (1969); Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Upjohn Co., 122 F.3d 1476, 44 USPQ2d 1181 (Fed.Cir. 1997).

As to claims 3, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the table function and the at least one messaging function are user-defined functions within the database system (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0034).

As to claims 4, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the at least one messaging function retrieves and reads the messaging data in the message system (see Drexter, page 4, paragraph 0042).

As to claims 5, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) reading the plurality of table formatting specifications from a file (see Drexter, page 4, paragraph 0041).

As to claims 10, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) providing formatting information about the messaging data (see Drexter, pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0033).

As to claims 11, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a1) further includes the steps of:

(a1i) designating a delimiter character, wherein the delimiter character separates the messaging data into column data (see Drexter, pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0031).

As to claims 12, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the converting step (c2) further comprising:

(c2i) invoking a parser function within the database system for parsing the delimited messaging data (see Drexter, pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0031).

As to claims 14, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a1) further includes the step of:

(a1i) specifying a fixed-length format by indicating a position (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0036) and length of each column (see Drexter, pages 2-3, paragraph 0030).

As to claims 15, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a2) allowing a user to view the messaging data in the messaging system to verify the formatting information provided before building the table function (see Drexter, page 6, paragraph 0064).

As to claims 16, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the messaging data comprises a message string, the message string including a plurality of substrings, wherein each substring represents data that is returned as a column in a table (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0037, where "column" is read on "field").

As to claims 17, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) defining a column for each substring of the plurality of substrings in the message string (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0036).

As to claims 22, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) allowing a user to create and name a table view based on the table formatting specifications (see Drexter, page 3, paragraphs 0034-0037).

As to claims 23, as modified, Drexter teaches wherein the invoking step (c) further includes the step of:

(c1i) selecting messaging data from the table view (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0036).

As to claim 24, as modified, Drexter teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) allowing a user to review a summary of the table formatting specifications before building the table function (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0035-0036).

As to claim 91, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the single database language statement is a single structured query language (SQL) statement (see Meier et al. column 2, line 33 through column 3, line 42).

As to claim 92, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the allowing step (a1) further includes the step of:

(a1i) allowing the user to view the table formatting specifications as database language statements before building the table function (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0035-0036).

5. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Meier et al. as applied to claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, and 22-24 above, and in further view of Demers et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,870,761).

As to claims 6, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the steps of:

(a1) selecting a name for the table function (see page 3, paragraph 0034);

(a2) specifying where the table function is to be stored (see page 3, paragraph 0034 and see page 4, paragraph 0041).

(a3) indicating where the messaging data resides (see page 3, paragraph 0038).

Drexter does not teach selecting a type for the table function, wherein the type includes one of a retrieve function and a read function.

Demers et al. teaches this (see column 5, lines 4-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Demers et al. because these teachings would allow other destination sites to dequeue the record (see Demers et al., column 5, lines 4-12).

As to claims 7, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the specifying step (a2) further includes the steps of:

(a2i) providing a database name and access information; and (a2ii) allowing the user to validate the access information (see Drexter, page 4, paragraph 0039).

As to claims 8, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the indicating step (a3) further includes the step of:

(a3i) providing a service point name for the messaging data (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0038).

As to claims 9, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the indicating step (a3) further includes the step of:

(a3i) providing a system default endpoint for the messaging data (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0037).

6. Claims 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Meier et al. as applied to claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-24, 26-31, 36-38, 40-43, 48-50, 52-58, 64-65, and 67-90 above, and in further view of Huth et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,704,742 B1).

As to claims 13, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the invoking step (d1) further includes:

(c2iA) checking for the parser function within the database system (see figure 2, reference number 42); and

(c2iC) registering the parser function in the database system after it is built to allow other table functions to invoke the parser function (see page 3, paragraph 0036).

Drexter does not teach

(c2iB) building the parser function if it does not exist within the database system.

Huth et al. this (see column 9, lines 30-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Huth et al. because these teachings would allow the manipulation of data in a way that was not previously defined (see Huth et al., abstract).

7. Claims 18, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Meier et al. as applied to claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-24, 26-31, 36-38, 40-43, 48-50, 52-58, 64-65, and 67-90 above, and in further view of Poskanzer (U.S. patent No. 6,658,426 B1).

As to claims 18, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the defining step (a1) further includes the steps of:

(a1i) naming each column (see page 5, paragraph 0056)

Drexter does not teach (a1ii) designating a data type for each column.

Poskanzer teaches this (see column 3, lines 39-43). Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Poskanzer because these teachings would determine how the SQL statement must be structured to access data relating to that field (see Poskanzer, column 3, lines 39-43).

As to claims 19, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the defining step (a1) further includes the step of:

(a1iii) allowing the user to view the messaging data formatted according to the column definitions provided (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0035).

As to claims 21, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the converting step (c) further includes:

(d1) parsing the message string into the plurality of substrings (see Drexter, page 5, paragraph 0056).

(d2) converting each substring into the designated data type corresponding to its column (see Poskanzer, column 3, line 54 through column 4, line 4).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 31 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's arguments that the combined references do not disclose "invoking the table function from within the database system through a single database language statement", the arguments have been fully considered, but are not deemed persuasive. The applicant states that "*Meier* describes the implemention of an "external trigger" which is a trigger that runs **externally** from the system software, i.e., a DBMS. which is different the claimed "invoking the table function **from within the database system** through a single database language statement". However applicant's "invoking" is done by after a "database language statement" (SQL statement) is sent from the client. The database's response to this statement is to invoke a UDF. As stated in the applicant's specification page 9, lines 20-22, "When the client invokes the table function, e.g., within an SQL statement, the table function accesses messaging data stored in a particular message queue 30, in step 120, by invoking an appropriate messaging function UDF 70." Meier teaches invoking UDF"s by using SQL statements. "Once created in the DBMS, UDFs can be invoked from any context where a SQL expression is expected or invoked from within any SQL expression as if they were built-in functions." See column 3, lines

18-21. Further, Meier teaches that UDF's can be applications made from languages such as C and C++, and that they are invoked by the RDBMS as a subprogram running inside of the server's address space as opposed to a stand-alone application running on the server machine which would be referred to as a stored procedure. Therefore, Meier teaches invoking a function from within the database using a standard language statement as claimed and disclosed in the applicant's specification.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Bétit whose telephone number is (571)272-4075. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 10:30 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571) 272-4078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

/jfb/
Examiner, Art Unit 2169
8 Oct 2008

/Tony Mahmoudi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169